



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/676,294	09/30/2003	Reza M. Golzarian	42P16397	8190
8791	7590	09/19/2005	EXAMINER	
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN 12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD SEVENTH FLOOR LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030			PHAM, THANH V	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2823	

DATE MAILED: 09/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

13

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No. 10/676,294	Applicant(s) GOLZARIAN ET AL.	
	Examiner Thanh V. Pham	Art Unit 2823	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 23 August 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

- 3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 - (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 - (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

- 4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
- 5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
- 6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
- 7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
 The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
 Claim(s) allowed: _____.
 Claim(s) objected to: _____.
 Claim(s) rejected: _____.
 Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

- 8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
- 9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
- 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

- 11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see attached.
- 12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
- 13. ☐ Other: _____.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 08/23/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
2. Applicant argues that the Akagawa reference does not teach "a conductive material comprising a unidirectional electrical conductivity configured to be in a direction corresponding to a projection to or from a contact point in a second conductive material as required by claim 1". Applicant is directed to col. 4, lines 11-17 wherein


"the anisotropic conductive sheet 38 is formed of a resin containing a conductive filler 39 (FIG. 2) such as a metallic powder, and by the application of pressure, becomes conductive in the pressed direction due to the continuity of the conductive filler 39".

The above quoted passage is the same as "unidirectional electronic conductive material 115 is mechanically stretched or stressed to orient the directionality of conductivity of the film " in the instant specification's p. 7, lines 4-6.

The phrase "by the application of pressure" of Akagawa is equivalent to "is configured to be" of claim 1; the phrase "becomes conductive in the pressed direction" of Akagawa is equivalent to "a direction corresponding to a projection" of claim 1; and "due to the continuity of the conductive filler 39" (from circuit pattern 40 to pad 36 in figs. 2-3) of Akagawa is equivalent to "unidirectional conductivity ... to or from the contact point and the second conductive material" of claim 1. Akagawa statement "becomes conductive in the pressed direction" cannot mean "omni-directional" as alleged but "between a pad and a circuit pattern" as admitted in the last paragraph of page 4 of the Remark.

3. Applicant's hypothesis on page 5 of the remark that "if pad 36 of Figure 2 were two pads instead of one sheet 38 would provide conductivity between both of the pads as well as between both of the pads and circuit pattern 40" is irrelevant. Because, firstly, each pad of Akagawa is unique by itself. Secondly, Akagawa's structure has many pads, each pad 36 has been conducted with the circuit pattern 40 through and in the pressed direction (in other words, is configured) only at that section of layer 39 (figs. 2-3), the other section which is not "localized" (word used in the last sentence of the Remark's page 4) is not conducted as not being pressed. Thirdly, if the two pads stand next to each other, the section of layer 39 in between the pads is not in the pressed direction (in other words, is not configured) to have the lateral conductivity. Further, if the two pads are too closed to each other, Akagawa (another hypothesis) could separate the sections of layer 39 so that they do not harm each other's conductivity in the operation of the whole structure and the theory of applicant cannot be applied.
4. The rejection to claims 1, 3-5 and 8-9 is maintained and claims 2, 6-7 and 10-14 are allowed as stated in the Final Office action mailed 06/23/2005.

TvP
09/08/2005


George Fourson
Primary Examiner